VOL. XII. MAY, 1904. No. 5.

INTERNATIONAL MONTHLY OF UNIVERSAL RELIGION

Devoted to the advancement of a religion that is free, spiritual and universal as contrasted with the religions that are creed-bound, traditional and sectarian.

ALFRED W. MARTIN, EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON, SEATTLE.
JOHN W. ROBERTS, ASSOCIATE EDITOR, 121 SOUTH G STREET, TACOMA.

CONTRIBUTORS.

OTTO PFLEIDERER, D. D., University of Berlin, Germany.
CHARLES VOYSEY, M. A., Theistic Church, London.
W. D. LESUEUR, LL. D., Ottawa, Canada.
PROF. TOKIWO YOKOI, Tokio, Japan.
WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON, Boston
CHARLES STRONG, D. D., The Australian Church, Melbourne.
PRES'T DAVID STARR JORDAN, LL. D. Stanford University, Cal.
RABBI CHARLES FLEISCHER, Boston.
B. F. UNDERWOOD, Quincy, Illinois
EDWIN D. MEAD, Boston.

"I make bold to say that we who are now living will behold—nay, may already behold—the dawn of the day of a new religion which is to be really universal in its principles and as broad as humanity in its boundaries; which is not, however, to be Christianity, nor Judaism, nor Buddhism, nor neo-Brahmanism, but a new faith into which the specific religions are in form to die that they may continue to live in spiritual substance."—WM. J. POTTER.

CONTENTS

The New Facts and the New Faith—D. J. H. Ward, Ph. D.
Short Answers to Questions Concerning God (*continued*)—Alfred W. Martin
The Law of Compensation—Hugh O. Pentecost.
"Of One" (*poem*)—James H. West.
The Creed of Thomas Paine—John W. Roberts.
Editorial—The Philosophy of Life (Rabbi ben Ezra).
Will they unite?
Spiritualism and Immortality.
Notes from the Field—Seattle:—Address of Welcome to new members.

Subscriptions should be sent to Samuel Collyer, 213 California Bldg., Tacoma, Wn.
Yearly $1.00 (4s.) Single Numbers 15 cts. (8d.) Issued Monthly, Except July to September.
Entered at the Post Office as Second Class Matter.

INTERNATIONAL MONTHLY
OF
UNIVERSAL RELIGION.

THE NEW FACTS AND THE NEW FAITH

By Duren J. H. Ward, PH. D.

To correspond with the recent immense progress in knowledge, there should be an increasing breadth of religious conceptions. There should grow out of the New Facts a restatement, or a New Faith, as much broader, deeper and more inspiring. Let me try to summarize these religious concepts. Let the reader take them only as kindly suggestion in the remaking of his own creed.

GOD HERE AND EVERYWHERE, replacing God "up in Heaven."

GOD IMMANENT, replacing God merely transcendent.

GOD INFINITE in power, goodness, beauty; lifting, blessing, thrilling, replacing ancient limiting anthropomorphisms.

GOD EVER REVEALED to unveiled eyes, replacing God present to Jewish prophets alone.

GOD INSPIRING ALL PEOPLE in all times, replacing God speaking only on Sinai and in Palestine.

GOD UNERRINGLY JUST THRU NATURAL LAWS and ever bountiful in renewed opportunities for erring life, replacing God angry and waiting till a final day to execute his "wrathful judgment."

CREATION by Eternal Divine Evolution, replacing creation by the fiat magic of the Hebrew Elohim or Yahweh.

STARRY SPHERES unnumbered, cycling thru celestial abysses, replacing early man's one, little flat "terra firma."

OUR PLANET a life-star on which man is making "Paradise," replacing the mythical "cursed earth, the lower world, the vale of tears."

MEN EVOLVED from lower life and steadily rising toward the Divine-human, replacing man "first perfect, then hopelessly fallen."

MEN OF ALL RACES included in one Divine family, replacing one nation as the only "chosen people of God."

MEN OF ALL TIMES elected (in the very Nature of things) to all the joys of heaven or earth, which they understand and

strive for, replacing a select few "elected (for unknown reasons) before the foundation of the world."

SIN, the contrast of outgrown conditions (physical, mental, moral) with the ideal, replacing sin originating in a legendary Satanic temptation inducing the fabled first, inexperienced, human pair to violate a trivial notion of his enemy, who also "walked in the garden."

EVIL thru misunderstood Divine activities, replacing evil thru the curses of an angry God.

SALVATION to greater and greater heights in the True, the Good and the Beautiful, by noble effort amid Divinely provided conditions, replacing salvation from an imaginary, future, material hell to an imaginary, future heaven.

SALVATION—real now and forever—by each one's own love and loyalty to actual Divine law, replacing the illusion of salvation thru believing in another's obedience and worth.

JESUS "the glorious instance of what you and I may become," replacing Christ, the Neo-Platonic creation, as "the only begotten son of God."

MIND the great and ultimately triumphant, spiritual force, replacing hopeless resignation to the sway of matter and sense.

SOCIAL OPTIMISM determined to rescue society from the domination of surviving animality by the evolution of universal altruism., replacing social pessimism, which resigns society to hereditary selfish greed, on the ground that "it is human nature."

HUMAN NATURE only that which exhibits human attributes, replacing the pseudo-human, coming in man's form and bringing with it the unreasoning self-centered desires and passions surviving from brute ancestry.

CO-OPERATION, generous labors for mutual, material and spiritual ends, producing and sharing life's blessings with all mankind, i. e., applied Christianity, replacing tacit submission to the religious garbed, but ego-centric claim that "competition is the eternal natural law," i. e., professed Christianity as illustrated by Aryan nations.

HEAVEN the spiritual state resulting from conscious harmony with the laws of Being, replacing unearned mansions built out of the dreams of tired or imprisoned serfs in far away ages.

HEAVEN brought to earth by the practice of heavenly graces, replacing futile hopes of heaven brought by outside grace or delusive promises of far-off heaven made to those whose

lives are sad because of unequal start, unequal help and unequal privilege here and now.

HOPE of a future, ultimate, spirit, joy-life for all soul-worth, replacing the material heavens of ancient ignorance and the now unspeakably woeful hells of age-lingering vindictiveness.

SHORT ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING GOD.

(Continued)

4. How would you define the modern idea of God?

The question has been wisely worded. The modern IDEA of God can be defined, but not God. To define means to draw a line about an object and to encircle the infinite, were that possible, would necessarily exclude vastly more than it includes. Inas much as God is infinite and eternal Energy, inseparable yet distinct from universal nature, God must exceed the possibility of complete human comprehension. If we could fully know God, bring God wholly within the range of our human finite faculties he would cease to be God. In order to be God he must transcend us and still transcend the higher we soar. Hence the saying of Comte "the heavens declare the glory of Newton and Hipparchus" is as irrational to the scientific inquirer as it is impious to the religious believer. Science, it is true, has destroyed mythologies and even religions, but not religion, and the heavens will declare the glory of God to the astronomer of the future as they did to the psalmist of old. God, then, cannot be defined; but this humble confession once made we may proceed to use such language as is least unsuited to so transcendent a theme, for imperfect speech is better than silence when we are seeking knowledge on the most fundamental of all religious problems. In the light of what has already been said in answer to earlier questions concerning God the modern idea of God may be succinctly defined as follows:

A Power, infinite, eternal, omnipotent, omnipresent, infinitely more than conscious, intelligent person and therefore to be called not "It" but "He" or "She" or both; not unknowable, but known to the extent that we know evolution, which is the way in which this Power acts; preventing all the evil which it is in the province of omnipotence to prevent given a law-governed, evolving universe.

5. Why use the personal pronoun "He" in referring to God?

Because our language is poor. We have no pronoun that combines the conceptions of fatherhood and motherhood. Theo-

dore Parker often began his prayers with the words "O Thou who art our father and mother." There is no reason why that form of expression should not be perpetuated, although one feels considerable sympathy with the thought and sentiment that prompted Emerson's pronounless prayer (spoken at the table of the Episcopal clergyman who asked him to say grace for the purpose of discovering whether or not Emerson believed in God) "Spirit of all good, make us thanktul."

Emerson's spontaneous revolt from the anthropomorphisms of traditional contemporary pulpits led him to "an almost habitual avoidance of pronons when speaking of deity, realizing as he did that God is not only person (the highest category of being known to man) but infinitely more than person besides. And in his recognition of this inclusiveness Emerson saw more deeply into the content of the "Infinite and Eternal Energy" than Spencer. For if God be infinitely more than person he must be at least person, an obvious truth too often overlooked and which makes the use of "He" rather than "It" absolutely imperative when a choice of pronouns to represent deity is being made.

We all are conscious of the subtle idolatry that lurks in personal pronouns yet if we are to speak of God at all we must make the nearest approach to exact expression possible in the present state of the english language. Modern scientific theism prompts the use of the personal pronoun in preference to the neuter on the ground that the universe is not only infinite machine and infinite organism, but also infinite person—a conclusion which, as worked out by the lamented Francis E. Abbot, in his "Scientific Theism," may be regarded as his peculiar contribution to philosophy.

6. Can the universe be accounted for satisfactorily in terms of matter?

This is the contention of the thorough-going materialist but it is significant that he scarcely enters upon his argument when what is tantamount to MIND is introduced. Let us imagine a typical representative of materialism summoned to state his case. He begins by asserting that with the help of only independent, unintelligent atoms and their conglomeration or collision the whole organic as well as inorganic world can be explained. We grant them; smooth, round and polished too, of the genuine Democritean type, and as many of them as there are chemical elements. How now, we ask, will you educe consciousness from your desired combination? We see only matter in motion and remember that Dubois-Reymond, one of the foremost apostles of your school, affirmed that there is an impassable

chasm between brain-atoms and the birth of consciousness. To all of which it is replied that atoms are affected by both gravitation and polarity; furthermore, molecules exist that are both organic and inorganic. But obviously this appeal to gravitation and organic molecules begs the question. It involves the introduction of FORCE and nothing but moving material atoms was asked for at the outset. Thus when pressed to explain consciousness or thought the materialist provides for the perplexing emergency by introducing a new factor, namely force, and now, with both matter and force, to ride, like the agile circus jockey, he saves himself from a fall by shifting his feet from one horse to the other.

In other words, the materialist, to make good his claim, gradually increases the content of his atoms until they are made equal to every task imposed upon them. Both the character and the content of his "matter" keeps on changing until at last it has been transformed from a beggar to a millionaire. First he deposits his matter-account in the bank of explanation and proceeds to draw on it piece-meal, seeming to meet every need without once incurring a debt, whereas with his very first cheque he overdrew his account and so forced his insolvent theory into the hands of a receiver.

By introducing into matter that which was not in it at the start, what is there that one cannot explain? "Matter" said Tyndall "is that mysterious thing by which all the phenomena of the universe have been accomplished from the evolution of a drop of water to the conscious life of man." But this statement is merely an oracle, not a definition.

It is the mystery of matter that the materialist must clarify in terms of matter if he can. Any other achievement is inevitably reasoning in a circle rather than towards a goal.

The truth is that Materialism as a satisfactory substitute for Theism has had its day. It has become exceedingly difficult to find a consistent champion of materialism for science herself has made it so by spiritualizing the universe, as she has, through her discovery in the eighteenth century of the indestructibility of matter and the still greater discovery, made in the nineteenth century of the "persistence of force" demonstrating that there exists an infinite and eternal Energy whence all things have proceeded and of which all the known forces of the universe are manifestations. In other words, the whole tenor and drift of modern science is steadily getting away from materialism and toward Theism the "persistence of force" being the scientific basis of the new idea of God.

THE LAW OF COMPENSATION.

By Hugh O. Pentecost.

The law of compensation is that you may have whatever you pay for. You may have as much money as you are willing and able to pay for. You pay with economy, industry, persistence, time, nerve-force, brain-force, concentration; sometimes by meanness, cruelty, sordidness; sometimes the price is so high that when you have obtained the money, you find or others find that you have exchanged for it truth, sweetness, generosity, faith, hope, love, your soul. This, when you want more than you wish to spend. Money is like the manna of the wilderness; sweet and wholesome if gathered and used, by faith, each day; breeding worms if hoarded by doubt. Money is a great blessing when bought with something of no greater value, and for spending by faith, knowing that more will come. But it must be paid for somehow even when it comes by inheritance. Then the price is the death of some one. And the price of keeping it must be paid. Envy not the rich. They pay for all they have. They are playing fair.

If you are willing and able to pay for fame or popularity you may have that. Fame falls into no one's lap. Alexander, Napoleon, Grant—each paid. Socrates and Jesus paid, and not too much for what they became. Did you think you could gain the high privilege of the hemlock or the cross without paying? Did you think men would worship you unless you gave them something for it? Shakespeare was not an accident. He paid. Does the popular orator, or statesman, or politician, driven behind the band, carried on men's shoulders, excite your envy? Do you wish you were looked at and talked about like that? Pay the price. He pays.

If money, fame, popularity do not tempt you; if you want obscurity, quiet, an easy chair, a warm corner, a few books, a few friends, leisure, freedom from bores and ennui, it is the same; give up other things. You cannot have what the pell-mell world gives and these things too.

If you will be yourself, defy conventions, walk over customs, preach new doctrines, go by short cuts, pay the price cheerfully. Accept ridicule, calumny, brick-bats, poverty, prison, with good nature. Use no flail of small cords; pronounce no woes; entertain no bitter thoughts; distill no pessimism. Did you think you could teach the scribes and pharisees, or those who follow them, anything? It is given to a few to learn before the time is ripe, but not to all nor to many. If you are one of that few, and if you will be true to what you know and are, you

cannot enjoy that rare luxury without paying roundly. Therefore, pay, and beware of complaining that the price is high. An angry prophet, Jonah complaining, a savior disappointed because men will not be saved by him, misreads the universe.

It is in the law of compensation that no life is a failure. That you do not get what you want is an illusion. You may not get what you lightly think you want, but you get what you actually want. If you have come short of material wealth, or whatever else you have fancied you want, it is because you have not been willing to pay the price. The universe gives you infallibly all you pay for. You may always know what you really want by taking stock of what you have. Do not rail at others for having what you have merely imagined that you want. Do not think that you are not being fairly treated. Nature knows no partialities, is no respecter of persons. Would you have something for nothing? You cannot.

It is in the law of compensation that you get all you need, and precisely what you need. We are like roots in the ground. We select from our environment exactly what is necessary for our health and growth. It does not always seem so, but it is so. Fret not about the wayward boy, the thoughtless girl, the drunken husband, the criminal in the open or in the prison, the poor man, the poor woman, the bereaved, the dying, the deade the prideful, the despairing. Love them, but fret not. Lov, them, and learn that it is not your affair but theirs. God does not interfere nor fret. You need not. Learn His way. Do not meddle. Be quiet and observe. Something good is occurring; something needful. Fret not because of your own weakness, mistakes, failures, sins. Love yourself, forgive yourself, believe in yourself, have faith. You think nothing, do nothing, bring nothing to yourself or upon yourself that is not needful. What occurs is good for you, not less good because it is ignorantly called evil.

It is in the law of compensation that your lot is as good as any other. Is your neighbor rich? There are offsets to that. Are you poor? There are advantages in that. Is your neighbor in health? There is a discount somewhere. Are you sick? There is a premium somewhere. The law of compensation is as sure as the law of gravitation. Trust it the same.

"OF ONE"

By James H. West.

Jesus, thy teachings oft have made me smart
When I have failed in love for fellow-men.
Siddartha, grief has been my portion when
Thy selflessness has taught my feverish heart
Its vain ambitions. When some coward start
Has seized me, thou, Mohammed, then
Hast stirred to bravery. Thy moral ken,
Confucius, spurs me when I fail life's better part.

O saviors many, of time old and new !—
Alike ye lead from darkness to the light.
O words as high within my own calm breast!—
No less ye summon Wisdom to pursue.
Still sound, O clarions of love and right,
Till I win Freedom serving your behest.

THE CREED OF THOMAS PAINE.*

By John W. Roberts.

In a recent number of the Forum, there appeared an extremely valuable discussion of the meaning and proper use of the word traitor. Among the many admirable things said therein we were told that the word traitor is an epithet involving serious consequences, and under no circumstances should be carelessly or thoughtlessly applied to any human being; that the citizens of a nation or a community ought to guard against its use if the grounds were in dispute; and that carrying with it as it did a moral stigma, no man or woman should be called a traitor unless there was indisputable evidence that the epithet was justly deserved.

In religion the word "infidel" has played the same part as the word traitor in politics. It has been used with the same carelessness and with equal disregard for the justice and grounds of its application. Passion and hatred have usually been the deciding considerations where nothing but the calmest and most impartial judgment ought to have had weight.

These general remarks about the use of epithets afford a very fitting introduction to our subject. For of all the men who have been called infidels no one stands out more prominently in American history than Thomas Paine. Does this epithet give

---

*The main portion of a discourse delivered in the First Free Church of Tacoma, Sunday, February 7, 1904.

us a truthful account of Thomas Paine's religious convictions?

Paine's authoritative utterances on religion are found in his notable book, "The Age of Reason," the only theological work he ever wrote. But the right of this book to represent his true religious views has been questioned. In the first place, it has been questioned on the ground that Paine gave utterance on his deathbed to ideas which amounted to a recantation. While the evidence for this is very scanty, its possibility must be admitted. But conceding that such a recantation was made, what value have such deathbed confessions? Religious partisans are usually on the lookout for the dying words of so-called infidels. More than once is it recorded that irreligious and godless men have on their deathbeds renounced their atheism and accepted salvation at the hands of a Christian priest. But are the religious opinions held by a man in the hour of death, when all his rational and spiritual faculties are weakened and impaired, superior to those which he held when in full possession of all his physical and moral powers? We know that civil contracts are often invalidated if it can be shown that one of the parties thereto acted under the disabilities of severe sickness. So I think we are justified on the whole in holding that deathbed confessions do not truthfully represent a man's religious views. And Christians should bear in mind that there may be a grain of dishonesty in the attempt to extort a confession of faith by the terrors of death. Such methods of winning converts to one's sect may not be inaptly compared to the modern "water cure."

In the case of Thomas Paine, however, there is no evidence that he ever recanted the sentiments embodied in the "Age of Reason." Whilst confined in a French prison, seized by a fever which showed every symptom of becoming fatal, he himself having little expectation of surviving and those about him less, it was then he remembered with renewed satisfaction and congratulated himself most sincerely on having written the "Age of Reason."

Now, let us glance at the motive that induced him to write this book. A common impression is, that in writing this book Paine was inspired by a malignant spirit. His motive, it has been said, was revolutionary and iconoclastic. The time and circumstance of its composition may have had something to do with giving this color to his purpose. It was written in the troublous days of the French revolution. The French national convention had been convened, the revolutionary government of the republic had been proclaimed, and the reigning monarch, Louis XVI., had been executed. And so dangerous did this uprising of the French populace against the monarchical and

priestly institutions appear, that the other European nations clasped hands in a united effort to defeat the liberal aspirations of the French people. Thomas Paine took in the situation at once. He foresaw the dangers of going to extremes and of forgetting that monarchs are dethroned, not that chaos and disorder may rule, but that just laws may supplant unjust and oppressive ones. So, said he, "I have written The Age of Reason lest in the general wreck of superstition, of false systems of government and false theology, we lose sight of morality, of humanity and of the theology that is true."

This is more than many modern clergymen would say today, for I have heard more than one of them express the wish that theology were banished from the earth.

That Thomas Paine had anything that might be called a religious creed must sound strange to those who have been in the habit of thinking of him as an infidel. Nevertheless on this matter, as on that of the motive for writing the book, he expressed himself as clearly as to make any misunderstanding of his meaning quite inexcusable. On the very same page where he described his motive, he wrote out his creed, which was this: "I believe in one God, and no more. And I hope for happiness beyond this life. I believe in the equality of man: and I believe that religous duties consist in doing justice, loving mercy and endeavoring to make our fellow-creatures happy." In this creed we find an openly avowed belief in the two most fundamental doctrines of religion He believed in God and he believed in a future life. He believed also in justice, and he loved mercy.

Clearly then, there never was a man so free from those characteristics which go to make up an infidel as Thomas Paine. For, if we can find out the reason we shall then understand what constituted his infidelity.

Thomas Paine was called an infidel because he believed that God was good. His conviction on this point was so deeply rooted as to make him exceedingly sensitive to everything which seemed to contradict the goodness of God. This is why he criticized so severely the Christian Bible, thus winning for himself the illwill of the Christian churches. Said he. "There are matters in that book purported to be done by the express command of God that are as shocking to humanity and to every idea we have of moral justice as anything done by Robespierre in France, by the English government in the East Indies, or any other assassin in modern times. When we read in the books ascribed to Moses, Joshua, etc., that the Isrealites came by stealth upon whole nations of people who as the history itself shows had given no offense; that they put all those nations to the sword;

that they spared neither age nor infancy; that they utterly destroyed men, women and children; that they left not a soul to breathe, are we sure that the Creator of man commissioned these things to be done? The Bible tells us that these assassinations were done by the express command of God. Therefore to believe the Bible to be true we must unbelieve all our belief in the moral justice of God."

These criticisms of the Christian scriptures which might be multiplied indefinitely were unquestionably the ground upon which Paine's infidelity was based. And it may be true that his criticisms were a little too sweeping but the motive which led to these criticisms is above reproach. It was his invincible faith in the goodness of God. And if the Christians had taken pains to trace the criticisms back to this faith as their cause they would have been less ready to accuse him of infidelity. The infideilty—the things he did not believe—grew out of the things which he did believe. And the things which he did believe were incomparably superior to the things which he did not believe. Paine's infidelity, therefore, was a consequence of his fidelity. His inability to charge God with the commission of crimes—which constituted the essence of his infidelity—was due to his belief in the goodness of God.

Our conclusion then is that Thomas Paine was not an infidel in any reasonable sense of the word; that he believed in God, in a future life and tried to save his fellowmen by teaching a theology that was true; that he was called an infidel because he disbelieved the Christian Bible and that he disbelieved the Christian Bible because he believed in the goodness of God. He could sing with Whittier: "To one fixed stake my spirit clings—I know that God is good."

EDITORIAL.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE.

Every reader of Browning's "Rabbi ben Ezra" has been helped by its stirring presentation of the practical philosophy of life. Human life is THE problem of supreme interest and thinking man has no pleasure so keen and profitable as the exercise of his intelligence on the questions of the whence and the whither, the why and the how of our earthly pilgrimage. It is upon these that the venerable Spanish Rabbi has exercised his mental powers and the product as presented in Browning's monologue constitutes a philosophy of life whose articles admit of universal and eternal application. They may be summed up

under nine heads each covering one or more of the thirty-two stanzas comprising the poem. We submit these articles, noting also their corresponding stanzas, hoping that several useful ends will be thereby served.

Article I.—Old age marks the development, not the decadence of our powers. Vs. 1.

Article II.—Man is not a beast or bird, formed to feed; doubt and moral responsibility differentiate him from them. Vss. 2-4.

Article III.—Life's adversities and trials are soul-stimulants, steps by which we "rise from our dead selves to higher things." Vss. 5-6.

Article IV.—Aspiration is what counts, let the results be what they may. Vs. 7.

Article V.—Both asceticism and sensualism represent a non-sane view of life. To have a body at its best is one of the first duties of a spiritual being. Vss. 8-12

Article VI.—Death has its part in our progress, therefore face it fearlessly. Vss. 13-19.

Article VII.—The world's measure of a man's worth is inadequate; only that estimate is true which credits him with all that was ignored in him by the world. Vss. 20-25.

Article. VIII—That which really is lasts forever and the function of passing circumstance and conditions is to develop the soul. Vss. 26-28.

Article IX.—God, the potter, has fashioned man's life, the cup, on the wheel of circumstance with success, therefore He will not break it.

Life here is inadequate to fulfil the soul's possibilities; the life loyal in its pursuit of the ideal is entitled to a future in which to continue its pursuit. Conscience and reason point to opportunity for endless progress toward the Ideal. Vss. 29-32.

In short, our poet-preacher bids us live not a sensual life because we are not brutes; live not a super-natural life because we are not angels; live not an aimless life because we are not insects, but live a true, human life, a divinely-human life because each one of us is "a God, though in the germ."

WILL THEY UNITE?

The recent exchange of pulpits on the part of two distinguished Unitarian preachers with two ministers of no less distinction in the Congregational church, and the more recent banquet of the Unitarian and Congregational Clubs of Boston indicate

afresh the gravitation of these sects toward a CHRISTIAN Unity destined to be the herald of a higher unity which is not simply Christian but HUMAN. We rejoice in these new evidences of a tendency long since jubilantly observed by all believers in the ideal of religious fellowship. But the union of these two sects, if it occurs, would not, in our judgment, represent a "triumph of Unitarianism" any more than of Orthodoxy. Rather would such a coming together represent the triumph of that catholicism or cosmopolitanism in religion which is steadily taking hold of an ever increasing contingent of the Christian church.

It is no irrational expectation to see a union of Unitarian and Congregational forces within the present decade. When it comes it will necessarily involve much compromise and concession on both sides. Nay more, it will involve inevitable refusal on the part of the progressive element in Unitarianism and the more conservative element in Congregationalism to join the newly-formed Christian sect. But the Unitarian secessions, at least, will make for another and higher fellowship with liberal independent churches which, in its turn, will help on the realization of that supreme fellowship for which our movement stands, a fellowship not of conflicting sects but of free souls, united in the freedom of the scientific method for the attainment of truth and in the love of humanity for the building of the commonwealth of man.

SPIRITUALISM AND IMMORTALITY.

It is certainly discreditable to both the intellect and heart to assume an attitude of indifference, dogmatism or contempt toward a movement that so deeply affects the lives of thousands as does Spiritualism. Only bigotry and ignorance will dare to assert that the foundation-belief of Spiritualism is false.

Nobody knows any such thing. On the contrary, we are confronted today by facts of the most stupendous importance in their bearing on immortality, facts that bring us to the very boundary line that separates probability from demonstration.

The distinguishing doctrine of Spiritualism, that which differentiates it from other religious movements, is the belief in immortality based on the alleged fact of spirit-intercourse. This doctrine is as old as man and has entered into every historical religion at its inception. Christianity began with a vision, a voice from the unseen; and Paul, its founder, based his whole system of salvation upon a miracle involving a resurrection and an ascension. Spiritualism, however, has an advantage over Christianity in

that it explains these phenomena as parts of the natural order; it brings the miraculous under the sway of law. Nay, more, the witnesses to its phenomena are living, whereas the first-hand witnesses to the Christian miracles are of unknown name and date.

Modern Spiritualism began in 1848 at Hydeville, Wayne county, New York. Here two children, Fox, by name, heard strange rappings which, it is said, brought them into communication with departed spirits who informed them that the skull of a murdered man was in the cellar of their house. In 1850 one D. D. Home reported similar phenomena, gradually others were reported and thrown into the psychic cauldron which the Fox children had set bubbling, and Spiritualism was the result.

The movement grew very rapidly. No one can tell how many adherents it has today, because they are to be found in all the Christian churches, and because hundreds have not the courage to confess their belief in the doctrine.

Its wonderful growth was due, indirectly, to the natural heart-hunger of man to know something positive about the hereafter; and, directly, to the widespread influence of two intellectual forces—materialism and criticism—both of which Spiritualism sought to overthrow. Materialism had taken all hope of a future life out of the hearts of thousands by its theory of matter; criticism had shown that the historical proofs for immortality are without a rational basis on which to stand. It challenged the thinking world to produce other proofs or else give up its belief. At this crisis Spiritualism came with its doctrine of spirit-intercourse, bidding the materialist and the critic come and see for themselves that there is positive evidence of the reality of a future life.

How natural it was that in its revolt against materialism, Spiritualism should have exaggerated its claim by saying that ALL psychic phenomena were due to the agency of invisible intelligences. Just here, it was, that the work of the Psychical Research society proved to be of special value, for it demonstrated that the great majority of these phenomena can be explained without any reference whatever to departed spirits. This took some of the "shine" out of Spiritualism. But there remains a certain group of phenomena not thus accounted for. Are these to be explained by the spiritualistic hypothesis? Prof. A. R. Wallace, Prof. Wm. Crookes and Mr. F. W. H. Myers, leaders of the Psychical Research society, have answered

"yes." But other members equally eminent as scientific thinkers answer "no." They remind us that telepathy is as yet very imperfectly understood. Who knows but what these wonderful phenomena manifested by the trance-medium, Mrs. Piper, (absolutely proved to be free from fraud and illusion) may yet be explained by telepathy or some other known psychic force akin to it? At any rate, while suspending judgment let us beware of the popular assertion that the whole subject is beyond the reach of demonstration. In a universe the size of this, with all its wonders and the mind of man most wonderful of all, we should be very modest and not too free in asserting what is possible and what impossible. The prayer of Ajax was for light. There can be no worthier prayer.

Whether people side with the late Mr. Myers in his belief that there exists an "irreducible minimum" of mediumistic messages inexplicble except on the spiritistic hypothesis, or whether they hold with Mr. F. Podmore (as candid and as able as Myers) that no such irreducible minimum exists, will be largely a matter of temperament. They who have never yet lost a near dear friend, never known the heart-ache of an irreparable loss and crushing bereavement will probably side with Podmore, while they whose hearts hunger for the renewal of broken con verse and friendship with those whom they have "loved long since and lost awhile" will incline to agree with Myers and wait for "the touch of a vanished hand and the sound of a voice that is still." But whichever side we take or sympathize with let us see to it that we keep the open mind, ever hospitable to every ray of light which free thought and serious reverent research may shed on the dearest deepest hope of the human heart.

NOTES FROM THE FIELD.

SEATTLE

ADDRESS OF WELCOME.*

It gives me great pleasure to welcome to our fellowship you whose names I have just read. On behalf of all the other members of our Society I greet you as fellow-workers in the noblest cause for which earnest men and women can unite. Let me express my deeply-felt hope that none of you have joined this

*Spoken Sunday evening, March 6, 1904, in Christensen's hall at the close of the discourse to the twenty-seven new members of the Seattle Society for Universal Religion, by Alfred W. Martin.

movement for any superficial or selfish reason, that none of you have become identified with it because of the proximity of this place of meeting to your home or because certain friends are members, or because of the enthusiasm which a single sermon roused in you, or because of some social or business advantage that might accrue from membership, but solely because you have read and pondered the objects for which our Society exists and found yourselves in complete accord with them and wanted to help promote them, to become personal factors in the community lending the weight of your influence, your presence, your energy, your purse to the cause of free, spiritual and universal religion.

There is a place in the community for an organization like ours; a need for it. All the other churches are doubtless doing much good in various ways, but they are organized on a different basis with narrower terms of fellowship and with much more limited ideals. They represent old, established sects with provincial religious aims. Ours is in form a new movement, catholic and cosmopolitan, and as such, has this supreme advantage that in it we are free to follow the inspirations of our hearts, to consult not so much precedents and traditions as the living ideal in our own minds and hearts. As an organization we have no historic past extending over centuries or over even a decade. Our new day has a freshness all its own and that which wins us and holds us to our work is not what we have accomplished but the vast unachieved that appeals to us for fulfilment.

When Garibaldi entered on his great task of emancipating Rome he made this startling but inspiring announcement "Let those follow me who are in love with cold and hunger, with wounds and death." So the summons of our free religion is to those who are in love with persecution, ostracism, ridicule, scorn, contempt; who so possess earnestness self-sacrifice and the fire of the apostles that they are ready to face any or all of these hardships; so fired with faith in ideas, with in man, faith in humanity, faith in science, in religion, in infinite Love working through universal law, that the world shall witness in them a new pentecostal out-pouring of courage and of consecration to truth.

Come to us, new members, in this spirit, with this determination and together let us press on, "on to the bound of the waste, on to the city of God," the commonwealth of Man.